

INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Proposition 50 Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Supplemental Funding Grant Program, July 2010

Applicant Bay Area IRWMP **Amount Requested** \$3,700,000
Proposal Title Bay Area IRWMP Priority Projects **Total Proposal Cost** \$5,150,000

Recommended Award \$0

Proposal Summary

The proposal presents the following four projects: (1) North Marin Water District Recycled Water Project - Phase 2 North Service Area, (2) Santa Clara Valley Water District South Bay Advanced Water Treatment Facility Ultraviolet Light Disinfection, (3) San Francisco Estuary Partnership Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Program, and (4) Bay Area Clean Water Agencies Mercury and PCBs Risk Exposure Reduction Program.

Presentation/Interview Score (based on criteria and standard presented in Table 2 of PSP)

Element	1 (a) - Concept Project Proposal Overview	1 (b) - Benefits & Technical Feasibility	1 (c) - Need & Consequences	2 - Question & Answers	Total (Max possible score=50)
Score	3	9	9	15	36

Evaluation Summary

Element 1 (a): Concept Project Proposal Overview

Graphics and illustrations were useful to the interview panel (Panel) in gaining a general understating the project work, but they were not helpful with other element criteria (i.e. to support benefits & technical feasibility and needs & consequences) as described below. Although the presentation was fairly clear and concise, it was at times not intuitive. For example, the scope work for individual tasks was not clearly explained. In addition, discussion of schedule was not sufficiently addressed.

Element 1 (b): Benefit and Technical Feasibility

As presented by the applicant, the projects were perceived to be only partially beneficial and medium in magnitude of benefit. In addition, benefits and technical feasibility were not adequately addressed and were not well supported. For example, the North Marin Water District project benefit of 186 acre feet a year seemed to be low in magnitude compared to the project costs. In addition, one of the presented benefits of the North Marin Water District project, reduced dependency on the Russian River, was not descriptive in terms of the timing and magnitude. The San Francisco Estuary Partnership Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Program subproject's benefits were deemed only "moderate." Technical feasibility was explained and seems reasonable, but only limited substantiating evidence was provided.

Element 1 (c): Need and Consequences

The need for the projects seemed to be moderate. The Panel felt the consequences of not receiving grant funds would be to maintain the status quo. As an example, the need and consequences of a "project delayed and agency partnerships discouraged" was not clearly presented. Additional detail would have been useful such as length of delay and to what cost (either financial or lost opportunity) to the partnership agencies. Although the need to reduce the risk exposure of humans to consuming potentially toxic fish is evident, the potential effectiveness of Bay Area Clean Water Agencies Mercury and PCBs Risk and Exposure Reduction Program was not sufficiently presented. The consequence of that program, as presented, does not represent the severity of many other project consequence presentation material provided.

Element 2: Question and Answers

The applicant's answers to the standard questions were concise, clear, and adequate. The applicant's answers affirmed they met the essence of IRWM when developing, vetting, and ultimately proposing multi-benefit projects.